

Appl. No. 09/734,262
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2005

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated August 5, 2005. Claims 6-11 are pending in the patent application. Claims 9-11 are amended. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Claims 9-11 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) and (d)(1) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Furusawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,050,227 ("Furusawa"). At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the rejections raised in the Office Action have been overcome and thus should be withdrawn.

Prompt and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Claims 9-11 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) and (d)(1) as described above. The Office Action stated that there was no antecedent basis for "the pixel". For clarification purposes Applicant has amended Claims 9-11 to recite a noticed pixel. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claims 9-11 are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the claims are rejected for alleged anticipation reasons as noted above.

Claim 6 relates to an image processing apparatus that includes weighting means for weighting pixel values based on the distance between the pixels and the positions of the boundary line calculated by a position calculation means.

Furusawa relates to a method for smoothing in a tangential direction of a contour and detail enhancement in its perpendicular direction simultaneously with spatial filters having a weighing factor distribution. However, Furusawa discloses only that the weighting factors can be influenced by the distance between a central pixel of a mask and the outline of a designated area. Col. 6, Lines 47-55. Furusawa does not disclose that the weighting factors are also influenced by the distance between the pixels. Thus, Furusawa does not disclose weighting means for weighting pixel values based on the distance between the pixels and the positions of the boundary line calculated by a position calculation means as described in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim 6 and Claim 9, which depends from Claim 6, are each patentably distinguished over Furusawa and are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons,

Appl. No. 09/734,262
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2005

Claim 7 and Claim 10, which depends from Claim 7, and Claim 8 and Claim 11, which depends from Claim 8, are each patentably distinguished over Furusawa and are in condition for allowance.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-11 are patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BY 

Thomas C. Basso (46,541)
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: September 26, 2005